INTERVIEW SUMMARY UNDER 37 CFR §1.133 AND MPEP §713.04

A telephonic interview in the above-referenced case was conducted on September 27, 2004 between the Examiner and the Applicants' representatives William James and Clover Huang. The Final Office Action mailed on July 19, 2004 was discussed. Specifically, the rejection of claim 1 in light of Gleichauf, Trcka, and Lee was discussed with the intent to place the claims in better condition for allowance or appeal. No agreement was reached with respect to the claims. The Applicants wish to thank the Examiner for his time and attention in this case.

REMARKS

Claims 10, 22-25, 30, and 39-40 have been canceled. Claims 1, 27-29, and 41-43 have been amended to clarify the subject matter regarded as the invention. Claims 1-9, 11-21, 26-29, 31-38, and 41-45 are pending.

Please note that in the first office action response, there was a typographical error in the last part of claim 43. The last part of claim 43 should have been underlined as follows to indicate that it was newly added to the claim: "whereby a critical set of data associated with a critical security event is timely selected for processing even under circumstances in which numerous sets of data associated with a corresponding set of security events that are related to each other but not to the critical security event are received prior to the critical set of data being received."

The Examiner has objected to claim 10 under 37 CFR 1.75(c), as being of improper dependent form. Claim 10 has been canceled.

The Examiner has rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Gleichauf et al. in view of Trcka et al. further in view of Lee.

The rejection is respectfully traversed. With respect to claim 1, Gleichauf, Trcka, and Lee do not teach either singly or in combination "*placing each set of data in a selected one of a plurality of queues based at least in part on a queue selection algorithm by which sets of data associated with related security events are grouped into the same queue while sets of data associated with unrelated security events are spread across different queues*" wherein "*the queue selection algorithm includes performing a first computation on a first at least a portion of the set of data to obtain a first index, performing a second computation on a second at least a portion of the set of data to obtain a second index, and selecting a queue for the set of data being processed based at least in part on the first and second indices, such that sets of data having the same values for both the first at least a portion of the set of data and the second at least a portion of the set of data are placed in the same queue*," as recited in claim 1. Support for the amendment to claim 1 may be found, without limitation, in the above-captioned application at page 24, lines 7-20 and page 27, lines 5-18. Gleichauf teaches prioritizing tasks and (at least temporarily) disabling lower priority tasks that consume resources beyond a prescribed threshold, but no queue selection algorithm is described. Gleichauf at 6:53-7:21. Lee describes using round robin

to service requests of equal priority, Lee at 4:56-5:2, but again does not describe assigning sets of data to queues as recited in claim 1. Trcka describes using a first-in-first-out (FIFO) approach to processing successively received sets of data, e.g., Trcka at 17:14-23, and as such teaches away from the prioritization taught by Gleichauf and the round robin approach taught by Lee. In any event, Trcka does not describe assigning successively received data sets to queues as recited in claim 1. Moreover, the FIFO approach taught by Trcka would be susceptible to the denial of service type attack that the approach recited in claim 1 overcomes, because a security system using the approach taught by Trcka could be overwhelmed by a flood of non-critical data potentially resulting in a subsequently sent set of critical data being received and processed by a protected system, potentially resulting in compromise of or other harm to the protected system, before it is (or without its being) detected. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over Gleichauf, Lee, and Trcka.

The Examiner has further rejected claim 1 under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over Conklin et al. in view of Gleichauf et al. further in view of Trcka et al. further in view of Lee. The rejection is respectfully traversed. As discussed above, Gleichauf, Lee, and Trcka do not teach, either singly or in combination, placing received sets of data in queues and servicing the queues as recited in claim 1. The Office Action acknowledges, at para. 10 on page 6, that Conklin does not describe storing sets of data in queues for processing. As such, claim 1 is believed to be allowable over the combination of Conklin, Gleichauf, Lee, and Trcka.

Claims 2-9, 11-21, 27-29, 31-38, 44, and 45 depend from claim 1 and are believed to be allowable for the same reasons described above.

Similarly to claim 1, claim 41 recites a processor configured to "*place each set of data in a selected one of a plurality of queues based at least in part on a queue selection algorithm by which sets of data associated with related security events are grouped into the same queue while sets of data associated with unrelated security events are spread across different queues*" wherein "*the queue selection algorithm includes performing a first computation on a first at least a portion of the set of data to obtain a first index, performing a second computation on a second at least a portion of the set of data to obtain a second index, and selecting a queue for the set of data being processed based at least in part on the first and second indices, such that sets of data having the same values for both the first at least a portion of the set of data and the second at*

least a portion *of the set of data are placed in the same queue.*" As such, claim 41 is believed to be allowable.

Like claim 1, claims 42 and 43 recite "*placing each set of data in a selected one of a plurality of queues based at least in part on a queue selection algorithm by which sets of data associated with related security events are grouped into the same queue while sets of data associated* with *unrelated security events are spread across different queues*" wherein "*the queue selection algorithm includes performing a first computation on a first at least a portion of the set of data to obtain a first index, performing a second computation on a second at least a portion of the set of data to obtain a second index, and selecting a queue for the set of data being processed based at least in part on the first and second indices, such that sets of data having the same values for both the first at least a portion of the set of data and the second at least a portion of the set of data are placed in the same queue.*" As such, claims 42-43 are believed to be allowable.

Reconsideration of the application and allowance of all claims are respectfully requested based on the preceding remarks. If at any time the Examiner believes that an interview would be helpful, please contact the undersigned.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 10/19/04

William J. James
Registration No. 40,661
V 408-973-2592
F 408-973-2595

VAN PELT AND YI, LLP
10050 N. Foothill Blvd., Suite 200
Cupertino, CA 95014